

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
MONDAY, MAY 6, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

The Supreme Court of California convened in the courtroom of the Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on May 6, 2002, at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Chief Justice Ronald M. George, presiding, and Associate Justices Kennard, Baxter, Werdegar, Chin, Brown, and Moreno.

Officers present: Frederick K. Ohlrich, Clerk; and Harry Kinney, Supreme Court Marshal.

- S100490 In re Nicholas H., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law

Alameda County Social Services Agency, Petitioner and Respondent
v.
Kimberly H., Objector and Appellant
Cause called. Frank H. Free argued for Respondent Thomas G.
Anthony E. Scarr, Deputy Attorney General, argued for
Respondent Alameda County Social Services Agency.
Sheri M. Cohen argued for Appellant Kimberly H.
Francia Welker argued for Minor.
Mr. Free replied.
Cause submitted.
- S098290 People, Plaintiff and Respondent
v.
Michael Joseph Sparks, Defendant and Appellant
Cause called. Steven T. Oetting, Deputy Attorney General,
argued for Respondent.
Robert E. Boyce argued for Appellant.
Mr. Oetting replied.
Cause submitted.

S016924 People, Respondent

v.

Kurt Michaels, Appellant

Cause called. Harry M. Caldwell opened argument for Appellant.

Karen Landau continued argument for Appellant.

Bradley A. Weinreb, Deputy Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Ms. Landau replied.

Cause submitted.

Court recessed upon 1:30 p.m. this date.

Court reconvened pursuant to recess.

Members of the Court and Officers present as first shown.

S097715 People, Plaintiff and Appellant

v.

Russell Hubert Statum, Defendant and Respondent

Cause called. Phyllis C. Asayama, Deputy Los Angeles District Attorney, argued for Appellant.

Dennis A. Fischer argued for Respondent.

Ms. Asayama replied.

Cause submitted.

S095401 Estate of Austin D. Stephens, Deceased

Katherine Stephens Vohs, Petitioner and Appellant

v.

Scott Williams, Claimant and Respondent

Cause called. Roger P. Sprigg argued for Respondent.

E. Michael Ambrosi argued for Appellant.

Mr. Sprigg replied.

Cause submitted.

S098552 People, Plaintiff and Respondent

v.

Steven Vaughn Williams, Defendant and Appellant

Cause called. Charles A. French, Deputy Attorney General,
argued for Respondent.

Linda J. Zachritz argued for Appellant.

Mr. French replied.

Cause submitted.

Court recessed until 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, May 7, 2002.

S076868 Theodore L. Haas, Plaintiff and Respondent

v.

County of San Bernardino et al., Defendants and Appellants

The decision of the Court of Appeal is affirmed.

Werdegar, J.

We Concur:

George, C.J.

Kennard, J.

Baxter, J.

Chin, J.

Moreno, J.

Concurring and Dissenting Opinion by Brown, J.

S092653 The People, Plaintiff and Respondent

v.

Christine Loyd, Defendant and Appellant

We therefore conclude that *De Lancie, supra*, 31 Cal.3d 865, no longer correctly states California law regarding inmate rights. Following the 1994 amendment to section 2600, California law now permits law enforcement officers to monitor and record unprivileged communications between inmates and their visitors to gather evidence of crime. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeal.

Brown, J.

We Concur:

George, C.J.

Baxter, J.

Chin, J.

Moreno, J.

Concurring Opinion by Kennard, J.

Concurring Opinion by Werdegar, J.

Concurring Opinion by Moreno, J.

I Concur:

Kennard, J.

S097450 Jeffrey Hambarian, Petitioner

4th Dist. v.

G026447 Orange County Superior Court, Respondent

Div. 3 People, Real Party in Interest

The time for granting or denying rehearing in the above-entitled case is hereby extended to and including July 17, 2002, or the date upon which rehearing is either granted or denied, whichever occurs first.

4th Dist. Renee Vicary dba Angels Sport Bar, Petitioner
E030224 v.
Div. 2 Court of Appeal Fourth Appellate District, Div. Two, Respondent
S105553 Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Alcoholic Beverage
Control Appeals Board of California, Real Parties in Interest
Application for stay and petition for writ of prohibition DENIED.

Bar In the Matter of the Application of the Committee of Bar Examiners
Misc. of the State of California for Admission of Attorneys
4186 The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the
following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for
admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to
the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to
the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another
time and place:
(LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED TO ORIGINAL ORDER)

